

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 15, 17-18 and 20 remain pending in the application. Claims 6, 8, 14, 16 and 19 were previously cancelled. Claims 1 and 11 are currently amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

1. TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW & CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicants' representative William A. Ziehler thanks Examiner Keith Walker for the courtesies he extended during the telephonic interview on October 7, 2009. We discussed the Advisory Action dated August 25, 2009 including the Examiner's statement that "[t]he claimed invention is directed to a passive vent, not a passive venting system." I proposed amending claim 1 to recite "a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function." The amendment language is taken from paragraph [0020] on page 8 of the original specification as filed, where it is stated "[a]s used herein 'passive' means that the hydrogen vent does not require any electrical or other active components to function." Examiner Walker agreed the amendment would distinguish the claim over active vent systems of the cited documents.

Applicants have, therefore, amended claim 11 in a similar fashion.

2. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Advisory Action dated August 25, 2009 indicated that the rejections of claims 9 and 20 under 35 USC § 112 are withdrawn.

3. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 / 103 – PETTIT

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11-13 & 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly obvious over Pettit (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0058861). This rejection is respectfully traversed as applied to the amended claims.

Independent claims 1 and 11 are not anticipated or obvious over Pettit as the document fails to provide a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function. The Pettit document discloses venting hydrogen by using electrical components and/or active components, such as a sensor (e.g., hydrogen detector), controller, or fan to provide a ventilation stream. Pettit paragraphs [0005], [0006], and [0047].

The Pettit document also does not actually vent hydrogen as hydrogen is instead combusted. The exhaust stream 70 of Pettit cannot function as a “second hydrogen vent.” The exhaust stream 70 comes from combustor system 46 which removes the hydrogen provided by anode effluent stream 32. Pettit paragraph [0031]; and see FIG. 1. The “combustor system 46 [is] operable to consume the remaining hydrogen in anode effluent stream 32.” Pettit paragraph [0021]. Thus, no hydrogen is vented via the exhaust stream 70 and accordingly it is not a “second hydrogen vent.”

What is more, the present claims are not obvious over Pettit as there is no reason to modify the document's disclosure to include the missing subject matter. Providing a passive vent in the Pettit apparatus would serve to contravene operation of the Pettit apparatus. Notably, Pettit combusts all hydrogen collected via the ventilation stream so that no hydrogen is actually vented from the fuel cell system. The "vent" in Pettit includes the ventilation flows 41 accumulating and passing through the catalytic combustion element 72 and exiting the outlet 42 of enclosure 40. Pettit FIG. 1; paragraph [0031]. As such, the vent is not passive and no hydrogen is actually vented. The hydrogen is detected and consumed prior exiting the outlet 42 of enclosure 40. The present claims are hence novel and not obvious.

Finally, modification or adaptation of the Pettit apparatus to include a passive hydrogen vent would contravene the Pettit disclosure and likely render aspects of the apparatus inoperable. Replacement of the outlet including the catalytic combustion element 72, combustor 46, and associated features including the anode effluent stream 32 (which contains hydrogen to be combusted) of Pettit with a passive hydrogen vent would defeat the Pettit teachings by not combusting the collected hydrogen; i.e., Pettit burns the hydrogen, there is no reason to passively release it. Moreover, use of a passive hydrogen vent would require removal or modification of the compressor, controller, and/or fan responsible for providing the ventilation streams 41. Such modifications are contrary to the function and goals of the Pettit disclosure and are counter to a case of obviousness. The present claims are therefore novel and unobvious over the Pettit document.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

4. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – PETTIT & BUZZELLI

Claims 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pettit (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0058861) in view of Buzzelli (U.S. Pat. No. 4,168,349). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Pettit disclosure are detailed in Section 3. Buzzelli is provided for teaching an iron/air battery cell having a sintered ceramic vent that acts as a flame and explosion barrier. Buzzelli col. 2, lines 55-60. However, the Buzzelli document fails to provide the missing features, teachings, and reasons necessary to overcome the deficiencies of Pettit. Namely, the document combination does not provide for a passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function. The document combination also does not disclose actually venting hydrogen (hydrogen is instead combusted) and providing a passive vent in the Pettit apparatus would serve to contravene operation of the Pettit apparatus, an action the combined documents provide no reason to take. Claims 10 and 17 are therefore patentable over the combination of Pettit and Buzzelli.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

5. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – PETTIT & GENC

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pettit (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0058861) in view of Genc (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0160245). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Pettit disclosure are illustrated in Section 3. Genc is provided for disclosing a release valve 30 having a membrane 40 operable to permit passage of gas and inhibit passage of liquid at a first pressure. Genc paragraphs [0019]-[0020] on pages 1-2; and Figure 2. The membrane may be constructed of various polymers. Genc paragraph [0021] on page 2. However, the Genc document fails to provide the missing features, teachings, and reasons necessary to overcome the deficiencies of Pettit, as illustrated in Section 2. Namely, the document combination does not provide for a passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, does not actually vent hydrogen (hydrogen is instead combusted), and providing a passive vent in the Pettit apparatus would further serve to contravene operation of the Pettit apparatus. Claim 3 is therefore patentable over the combination of Pettit and Genc.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

6. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – PETTIT, BUZZELLI & GENC

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pettit (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0058861) of view of Buzzelli (U.S. Pat. No. 4,168,349) as applied to claim 17 above and further in view of Genc (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0160245). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Pettit disclosure are illustrated in Section 3, the Buzzelli disclosure is illustrated in Section 4, the Genc disclosure is illustrated in Section 5. However, the Buzzelli and Genc documents fail to provide the missing features, teachings, and reasons necessary to overcome the deficiencies of Pettit, as illustrated in Section 3. Namely, the

document combination does not provide for a passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, does not actually vent hydrogen (hydrogen is instead combusted), and providing a passive vent in the Pettit apparatus would further serve to contravene operation of the Pettit apparatus. Claim 18 is therefore patentable over the combination of Pettit, Buzzelli, and Genc.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

7. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – PETTIT & WALSH

Claims 9 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Pettit (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0058861) in view of Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Pettit disclosure are illustrated in Section 3. Walsh is provided for disclosing that “an integrated fuel cell system may or may not be housed in a common enclosure.” Walsh paragraph [0009]; and see discussion of Walsh in Section 8 below. However, the Walsh document fails to provide the missing features, teachings, and reasons necessary to overcome the deficiencies of Pettit, as illustrated in Section 3. Namely, the document combination does not provide for a passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, does not actually vent hydrogen (hydrogen is instead combusted), and providing a passive vent in the Pettit apparatus would further serve to contravene operation of the Pettit apparatus. Claims 9 and 20 are therefore patentable over the combination of Pettit and Walsh.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

8. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16 & 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 11 are not obvious over Walsh as the document fails to provide for any of the passive hydrogen vent limitations, the hydrogen concentration limitations, the first and second hydrogen vents, and the first and second enclosures. Moreover, there is no apparent reason for a skilled artisan to include the missing subject matter in the context of Walsh.

Claim 1 is drawn to a fuel cell that includes “providing a first passive hydrogen vent in the first enclosure, the first passive hydrogen vent configured to passively maintain the level of hydrogen which leaks into the first enclosure below a concentration level of about 4 percent without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function” and “a second hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the second enclosure.” Claim 11 is drawn to a method of manufacturing a fuel cell that includes “providing a first passive hydrogen vent in the first enclosure, the first passive hydrogen vent configured to passively maintain the level of hydrogen which leaks into the first enclosure below a concentration level of about 4 percent without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function” and “providing a second hydrogen vent in the second enclosure.” These features are absent from Walsh and therefore the document cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as the document is missing the aforementioned claimed features.

Walsh is provided for disclosing a vent 114 in a water tank 102. Walsh page 3, paragraph [0032]; and Figures 1-3. However, the Walsh disclosure has several shortcomings and flaws. First, the document provides that condensate in the anode feed 342 and the anode exhaust 344, which may contain combustible gases (i.e., hydrogen), may be dealt with in two different ways. One way is to include water traps, such as 348 and 352, on drain lines to send water to the water tank 302 and thereby limit exposure of the water tank to such hydrogen-containing streams. Walsh page 4, paragraph [0037]; and Figure 3. The other way is by continually purging the atmosphere of the water tank with an air stream to prevent buildup of combustible gases, obviating the need for the water traps. Walsh page 4, paragraph [0037]. Continually purging the atmosphere of the water tank with an air stream is actively forcing gas out through the vent, meaning the Walsh vent is not a passive vent. *Cf.* language in claims 1 and 11; e.g., “a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function.”

Second, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant, it is holding condensate. The water tank 102 is not a coolant reservoir and is not even part of a coolant flow path. Instead, the Walsh teachings are directed toward removing condensate from a process stream in a fuel cell system. Walsh page 1, paragraph [0008]. For example, condensate can interfere with flow of process streams and can build to levels that can flood portions of the system, and can cause problems if allowed to freeze. Walsh page 1, paragraph [0008].

Third, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O_2) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H_2). Walsh page 3, paragraph [0032]; and see Figures 1-3. For example, the cathode inlet conduit 104 and outlet gas conduit 106 are connected to the water tank 102; note also that the water tank 102 is separate from the fuel cell stack 100. The vent 114 allows gas to exit as it

circulates through the tank 102. Thus, the cathode streams provided to the water tank 102 in Walsh do not even contain hydrogen; i.e., there is no hydrogen to vent.

Fourth, as stated by the present rejection, “Walsh is silent to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant.”

Nonetheless, the rejection posits that “it is well-known in the art to collect bi-product [sic] water and condensate water from the fuel cell and exhaust streams and use the water as part of a cooling system.” Office Action dated June 15, 2009 page 7, lines 17-18. At the outset, Applicants submit that the Examiner’s conjecture is both unsupported and erroneous. Applicants request that the Examiner submit an affidavit supporting his personal knowledge that it is well-known in the art to collect byproduct condensate water and use such water in a cooling system for a fuel cell, as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 (d)(2) or otherwise support that conjecture with evidence.

On the other hand, if the Examiner is taking official notice of the above quoted subject matter, Applicants submit that such official notice is improper in the present case as official notice cannot be taken of the state of the art or where the alleged “common knowledge” forms part of the principal evidence upon which a rejection is based. See *In re Eynde*, 480 F.2d 1364, 1370, 178 USPQ 470, 474 (CCPA 1973) (“[W]e reject the notion that judicial or administrative notice may be taken of the state of the art. The facts constituting the state of the art are normally subject to the possibility of rational disagreement among reasonable men and are not amenable to the taking of such notice.”). In particular, it is never appropriate to rely solely on “common knowledge” in the art without evidentiary support in the record, as the principal evidence upon which a rejection is based. See *In re Zurko*, 258 F.3d 1379, 1385, 59 USPQ2d 1693, 1697 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (“[T]he Board cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or

experience—or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings.”).

Applicants further submit that the proposed use of the water condensate in a coolant system is contrary to the Walsh disclosure and the general art of coolants and fuel cell systems. As evidence, Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to Walsh paragraph [0008] where the document recognizes that water “condensate can . . . cause problems if allowed to freeze (e.g., in an outdoor unit that is not in service).” This is one reason why Walsh collects and removes the water condensate. See also, for example, U.S. Patent No. 7,393,464, describing an alkylene glycol coolant used in a fuel cell; a hardcopy was submitted with the reply dated August 14, 2009. One would not want to dilute a coolant mixture by adding collected condensate water as such dilution would reduce the effectiveness of freezing point depressants and additives.

The rejection also fails to provide any guidance, instruction, or analysis as to how a skilled artisan would adapt the Walsh disclosure to accommodate a cooling system and perform the requisite engineering and plumbing in of the byproduct water and condensate water to such a cooling system. Such details are necessary for a case of obviousness. This burden is not met in the present rejection based on Walsh and the allegation that it is “well-known in the art to collect bi-product [sic] water and condensate water from the fuel cell and exhaust streams and use the water as part of a cooling system.” Office Action dated June 15, 2009 page 7, lines 17-18.

Moreover, as noted in MPEP 2143.01(IV), a statement that modifications of the prior art to meet the claimed invention would have been “well within the ordinary skill of the art at the time the claimed invention was made” because the documents relied upon teach that all aspects of the claimed invention were individually known in the art is not sufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness without some objective reason to combine the teachings of the

references. *Ex parte Levensgood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (BPAI 1993). Accordingly, Walsh cannot support a case of obviousness.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

9. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH & GRASSO

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16 & 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881) in view of Grasso (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/023228). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Walsh disclosure are illustrated above in Section 8. Grasso discloses a liquid-gas separator assembly for separating gas bubbles from a liquid coolant. Grasso abstract. Separated gas is pulled through a line 26 by vacuum pump 25 to an accumulator 20 and vented through line 21. Grasso paragraph [0014]. In contradistinction to the rejection, Grasso is silent with respect to running the process continuously and there is no mention of when or how often the accumulator 20 is purged to vent gas. There is no appreciation of accumulating hydrogen gas and there is no indication that operation of the Grasso assembly would in fact mitigate hydrogen build-up to levels of 4% or 1%. It may be just as possible for the accumulator 20 to fill with separated gas, such as hydrogen, prior to any venting, as the Grasso disclosure is simply silent with respect to hydrogen.

Grasso also fails to supply the missing subject matter and cure the deficiencies of Walsh as previously illustrated. Namely, the document combination lacks a passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant – it is holding

condensate, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O_2) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H_2), and the document combination is silent with respect to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant.

In addition, there is no disclosure in Walsh or Grasso as to how or why a skilled artisan would combine the condensate water collection system of Walsh (which makes no mention of coolant) with the liquid-gas separator assembly (coolant mixture separator) from Grasso. The rejection fails to explicitly provide any way a skilled artisan would combine the separate disclosures, and there no illustration of how and where the two systems could be connected and plumbed together to effectively operate. The instant claims are therefore patentable over the combination of Walsh and Grasso.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

10. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH & NODA

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16 & 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881) in view of Noda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,623,390). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Walsh disclosure are illustrated in Section 8. Noda is provided for teaching that hydrogen gas should be vented from a computer having a nickel-hydrogen battery so that it does not reach the explosive concentration of 4%. Noda col. 9, lines 7-27. Even so, Noda does not relate this problem to fuel cells, nor does Noda solve a problem of accumulation of H_2 in a coolant system or coolant reservoir, nor does Noda provide any guidance regarding the configuration of vents and enclosures within fuel cells and cooling systems.

Catastrophic battery failure is an entirely different problem than the issues addressed by the present claims.

Noda fails to address the several shortcomings of Walsh and provides no means or suggestion to cure Walsh's deficiencies. Namely, the document combination lacks a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant – it is holding condensate, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O_2) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H_2), and the document combination is silent with respect to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant. As such, the present claims are not obvious over the combined documents.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

11. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH, GRASSO, & NODA

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16 & 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881) and Grasso (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/023228) in view of (U.S. Pat. No. 5,623,390). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Walsh disclosure are illustrated in Section 8, the Grasso disclosure in Section 8, and the Noda disclosure in Section 10. Addition of the Grasso and Noda disclosures fails to supply the missing subject matter of Walsh and does not provide the means to cure the Walsh deficiencies. Namely, the document combination lacks a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant – it is

holding condensate, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O₂) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H₂), and the document combination is silent with respect to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant. As such, the present claims are not obvious over the combined documents.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

12. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH, NODA & BUZZELLI

Claims 10 & 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881) in view Noda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,623,390) as applied to claims 1 & 16 respectively and further in view of Buzzelli (U.S. Pat. No. 4,168,349). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Walsh disclosure are illustrated in Section 8, the Noda disclosure in Section 10, and the Buzzelli disclosure in Section 4. Combination of the collected teachings fails to provide for a case of obviousness as Noda and Buzzelli do not account for the flaws of the primary document of Walsh. Namely, the document combination lacks a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant – it is holding condensate, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O₂) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H₂), and the document combination is silent with respect to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant. As such, the present claims are not obvious over the combined documents.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

13. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH, NODA & GENC

Claims 3, 5 & 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881) in view Noda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,623,390) as applied to claims 1, 2, 4 & 12 respectively and further in view of Genc (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0160245). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Walsh disclosure are illustrated in Section 8, the Noda in Section 10, and the Genc disclosure in Section 5. Combination of the collected teachings fails to provide for a case of obviousness as Noda and Genc do not account for the flaws of the primary document of Walsh. Namely, the document combination lacks a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant – it is holding condensate, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O₂) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H₂), and the document combination is silent with respect to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant. As such, the present claims are not obvious over the combined documents.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

14. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 – WALSH, NODA, BUZZELLI & GENC

Claim 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0118881) in view of Noda (U.S. Pat. No. 5,623,390) and Buzzelli (U.S. Pat. No. 4,168,349) as applied to claim 17 and further in view of Genc (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0160245). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The shortcomings of the Walsh disclosure are illustrated in Section 8, the Noda disclosure in Section 10, the Buzzelli disclosure in Section 4, and the Genc disclosure in Section 5. Combination of the collected teachings fails to provide for a case of obviousness as Noda, Buzzelli, and Genc do not account for the flaws of the primary document of Walsh. Namely, the document combination lacks a first passive hydrogen vent configured to vent hydrogen from the first enclosure without reliance upon any electrical device or other active components to function, Walsh's water tank is not holding coolant – it is holding condensate, the Walsh water tank has the cathode gas stream (O₂) fed into it, not the anode gas stream (H₂), and the document combination is silent with respect to using the collected water in the reservoir as a coolant. As such, the present claims are not obvious over the combined documents.


Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims and withdrawal of the rejection.

15. CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct. 15, 2009

By: 
William A. Ziehl, Reg. No. 61,415

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

WAZ/srh

15102015.2